

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are pending in the application. In the Office Action of June 15, 2006, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Objected to the drawings.
- B.) Objected to the specification.
- C.) Rejected claims 1, 2, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Killebrew, et al.*
- D.) Rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Killebrew, et al.* in view of *Snyder*.
- E.) Rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Killebrew, et al.* in view of *Hasenauer*.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and addresses the Examiner's disposition below.

A.) Objection to the drawings:

Figure 6B has been amended as per the Examiner's request to overcome the objection.

A replacement drawing sheet for Figures 5, 6A, 6B, 6C, and 6D is submitted with a Submission of Corrected Drawings submitted herewith.

Applicant respectfully submits the objection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

B.) Objection to the specification:

The title of the invention has been amended as per the Examiner's request to overcome the objection.

The specification has been amended as per the Examiner's request to overcome the objection.

No new matter is added by the amendments made herein.

Applicant respectfully submits the objection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

C.) Rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Killebrew, et al.*:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Independent claim 1, as amended, claims a battery pack housing a plurality of battery

cells. The battery pack comprises a case having a conductive terminal board respectively connecting positive electrodes and negative electrodes of the plurality of battery cells to outside terminals. The conductive terminal board has a structure in which a first member is joined with a second member such that the first member having excellent weldability is arrayed in a plurality-of-islands state in the second member having excellent conductivity. The first member of the conductive terminal board includes a rectangular slit in at least one island portion of the first member. (See, e.g., slits in islands of first member 11 in Figures 2 and 3). As discussed in Applicant's specification, the first terminal board being arrayed in a plurality-of-islands state in the second terminal board allows the conductive terminal board to thinner than conventional conductive terminal boards. (Specification page 6, lines 17-24).

This is unlike *Killebrew*, which fails to disclose or suggest a first member including a rectangular slit in an island portion. As clearly shown in *Killebrew* Figure 1B, *Killebrew*'s first members 108A and 108B do not include rectangular slits. For at least this reason, *Killebrew* fails to disclose or suggest claim 1.

Further, unlike Applicant's claimed invention, *Killebrew* fails to disclose or suggest a first member arrayed in a plurality-of-islands state in a second member. *Killebrew* clearly teaches individual, separated first members 108A and 108B. These are not a first member having a plurality of islands, and *Killebrew*'s first members are not arrayed in its second member 102A. For at least these additional reasons, *Killebrew* fails to disclose or suggest claim 1.

Claims 2-4 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

D.) Rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Killebrew, et al.* in view of *Snyder*:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Applicant's claim 1 is allowable over *Killebrew* as discussed above. *Snyder* still fails to disclose or suggest a first member including a rectangular slit in an island portion. Therefore, *Killebrew* in view of *Snyder* still fails to disclose or suggest claim 1.

Claim 3 depends directly or indirectly from claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be

withdrawn.

E.) Rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Killebrew, et al. in view of Hasenauer:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Applicant's claim 1 is allowable over *Killebrew* as discussed above. *Snyder* still fails to disclose or suggest a first member including a rectangular slit in an island portion. Therefore, *Killebrew* in view of *Snyder* still fails to disclose or suggest claim 1.

Claim 3 depends directly or indirectly from claim 1 and is therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-4 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHEIN, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #26263
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the drawing sheet for Figures 5, 6A, 6B, 6C, and 6D with the replacement sheet for Figures 5, 6A, 6B, 6C, and 6D submitted with the Submission of Corrected Drawings submitted herewith.